REALIZABILITY OF HYPERGRAPHS AND RAMSEY LINK THEORY [1]

A. Skopenkov [2]

arXiv:1402.0658v3 [math.MG] 3 Sep 2015

Abstract

This note is expository and is accessible to students who know basic geometry of three-dimensional space and who are ready to learn straightforward generalizations to four-dimensional space. We present short elementary proofs of Conway-Gordon-Sachs Theorem on graphs in three-dimensional space, as well as van Kampen-Flores' and Ummel's theorems on nonrealizability of certain hypergraphs in four-dimensional space. The proofs use a reduction to lower dimensions. Such a reduction exhibits relation between these results and allows higher-dimensional generalization. We use the elementary language of collections of points, so we do not need the formal notion of hypergraph.

Contents

1 Informal introduction **2**

2 Formal statements of main results **4**
2.1 Linking and intersection in the line and in the plane 5
2.2 Linking in 3-space 5
2.3 Linking and intersection in higher dimensions 6
2.4 Realizability of products 7

3 Linking and intersection in the plane **7**
3.1 Proof of the Intersection Property 2.1 7
3.2 Some related results 9

4 Linking and intersection in three-dimensional space **10**
4.1 Weak versions of the Linear Conway-Gordon-Sachs Theorem 10
4.2 Proof of the Linear Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem 11
4.3 Some related results 11
4.4 (m, n)-products in three-dimensional space 12
4.5 Parity Lemmas 13

5 Linking and intersection in four-dimensional space **14**
5.1 The Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem 2.4 14
5.2 (m, n)-products in four-dimensional space 16

[1] This text is based on the author's lectures at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Independent University of Moscow, summer school 'Modern Mathematics', Summer Conference of Tournament of Towns, Kirov region summer school, Moscow 'olympic' school, circle 'Olympiades and Mathematics'. I am grateful to M. Skopenkov for joint writing an earlier version of this text, to A. Zimin for notes on Example 2.9.ab, to O. Viro for critical but encouraging remarks, and to G. Chelnokov, A. Matushkin, A. Rukhovich, A. Shapovalov, M. Skopenkov, A. Sossinsky, A. Zimin, J. Zung for useful discussions.

[2] `www.mccme.ru/~skopenko`. Supported in part by RFBR, Grants No. 07-01-00648a and 15-01-06302, the D. Zimin Dynasty foundation, and the Simons-IUM fellowship.

6 Realizability of graphs **17**
6.1 Embedded sets of segments 17
6.2 Linear realization of graphs 18
6.3 Definition of homeomorphic graphs and the body 18
6.4 Planarity of graphs 19

7 Linear realizability of hypergraphs **20**
7.1 Embedded sets of triangles 20
7.2 Linear realization of hypergraphs 21
7.3 Linear realizability of products 21
7.4 Definition of homeomorphic hypergraphs and the body 22
7.5 Piecewise-linear realizability of hypergraphs 23
7.6 Topological realizability of hypergraphs 24

8 Rado and Tverberg Theorems **24**

Hints to remarks **25**

'It's too difficult.'
'Write simply.'
'That's hardest of all.'
I. Murdoch, The Message to the Planet.

1 Informal introduction

'Impossible constructions' like the impossible cube, the Penrose triangle, the blivet etc [I] are well-known, mainly due to pictures by M.C. Escher. In geometry, topology, and graph theory there are also famous basic examples of 'impossible constructions'. The pictures do not allow the global spatial interpretation because of collision of local spatial interpretations to each other. In the same way, small parts of many mathematical 'impossible constructions' are possible.

E.g., one cannot construct 3 houses and 3 wells in the plane and join each house to each well by a path so that paths intersect only at their starting points or endpoints. [3] In this note we present a natural interesting generalization: examples of *two-dimensional* analogues of graphs nonrealizable in four-dimensional space.

Such analogues are (*two-homogeneous*) *hypergraphs* defined as collections of three-element subsets of a finite set. (In topology such objects are called *dimensionally homogeneous two-dimensional simplicial complexes*, but I hope the term hypergraph is more convenient to generic mathematician or computer scientist.) For instance, *a complete two-homogeneous hypergraph* on k vertices is the collection of all three-element subsets of a k-element set. *Realizability* of a hypergraph in *n-dimensional Euclidean space* $\mathbb{R}^n$ is defined similarly to the realizability of a graph in the plane (one 'draws' a triangle for each three-element subset; see Figures 1 and 2). Rigorous definition of the realizability is given in §7.1, §7.2. Hypergraphs and simplicial complexes play an important role in mathematics. One cannot imagine topology and combinatorics without them. They are also used in computer science and bioinformatics [PS11].

[3] In graph-theoretic terms this means that the complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ is not planar.



Figure 1: Left: Realization in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the complete two-homogeneous hypergraph on 5 vertices. Right: Realization in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the *product* of the complete graphs on 5 and on 2 vertices.

We state beautiful and nontrivial examples of the nonrealizability of hypergraphs in terms of certain systems of points, see §2. So we do not use the notion of hypergraph and its realizability neither for the statements nor for the proofs. Thus no knowledge beyond high-school level is required for understanding most of the paper. However, these notions help to understand the motivation of the results. We mention hypergraphs in this section and give precise statements involving hypergraphs in §7.



Figure 2: Left: Realization in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of the *square* of the complete graph on 2 vertices. Middle: Realization in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the *product* of the complete graphs on 2 and on 3 vertices. Right: Realization in $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the *square* of the complete graph on 3 vertices.

It is easy to construct a hypergraph nonrealizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (see Problem 4.1). Already in the early history of topology (1920s) mathematicians tried to find hypergraphs nonrealizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$. E.g. the complete two-homogeneous hypergraph on 7 vertices is not realizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$, cf. Theorem 2.4 below. This celebrated result was proved by van Kampen and Flores in 1932-34 [vK32, Fl34], cf. [Fo04]. It is both an early application of *combinatorial topology* (nowadays called algebraic topology) and one of the first results of *topological combinatorics* (also an area of ongoing active research).

For each two figures F, G in space their *(Cartesian) product* $F \times G$ is the set of points $(x, y, z, x_1, y_1, z_1) \in \mathbb{R}^6$ such that $(x, y, z) \in F$ and $(x_1, y_1, z_1) \in G$. A combinatorial version of this notion is *product* of two graphs (not necessarily planar) which is a hypergraph; see Figure 2 (a formal definition is given in §7.3). Karl Menger conjectured in 1929 that the square of a nonplanar graph is nonrealizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$ [Me29]. This conjecture was proved only in 1978 by Brian Ummel [Um78], cf. Theorem 2.8 below. [4]

[4]There is a short formula for the minimal number d such that given product of several graphs embeds into $\mathbb{R}^d$, see Theorem 7.7. This formula (generalizing the Menger Conjecture) was announced in a 1992 preprint of Marek Galecki. However, after an extensive search Robert J. Daverman kindly informed Peter

A 'small shift' (or 'general position') argument shows that each graph is realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$. A straightforward generalization shows that each hypergraph is realizable in $\mathbb{R}^5$.

A striking idea is that the nonrealizability of hypergraphs in $\mathbb{R}^4$ can be reduced to three-dimensional results due to John Conway, Cameron Gordon and Horst Sachs. A simplified version of one of them states that *for any 6 general position points in 3-space there are two linked triangles with the vertices at these points.* See Theorems 2.3 and 4.5 below. Before reducing the 4-dimensional results to the 3-dimensional results, we reduce the 3-dimensional results to certain 2-dimensional results, and the 2-dimensional results to certain 1-dimensional result. Because of such 'lowering of dimension' a reader not familiar with 4-dimensional space needs not be scared. For such reductions we prove Parity Lemmas. This allows to exhibit some basic ideas of homology theory (i.e. Poincaré Lemma on the homology of Euclidean space) in an elementary language accessible to non-specialists.

The above sequence of reductions allows to discover that the nonrealizability results and the linking results turn out to be particular cases of a result for arbitrary dimensions, see Theorem 2.5 below. So the nonrealizability results may be called 'Ramsey intersection theory', just as the Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem is departure point of *Ramsey linking theory*, cf. [Sa81, CG83, PS05]. For the sake of accessibility we do not mention dimensions higher than 4 outside Theorem 2.5.

Of course this 'lowering of dimension' idea is well-known for specialists. However, such proofs seems not to be published before [Sk03] for the Menger Conjecture and [RSSZ, Zi] for the van Kampen-Flores and the Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorems.

We present short elementary proofs of the *linear* versions of the above classical results. (Short algebraic proofs in the spirit of the Radon theorem on convex hulls are given in [BM]. However, those proofs do not generalize to *piecewise-linear* nonrealizability.) These proofs are easily generalized to *piecewise-linear* (PL) versions. PL versions imply the original *topological* versions (because actually stronger PL results are proved). The PL van Kampen-Flores Theorem has an alternative elementary proof using *the van Kampen invariant*, see [Sk, 2.1] and [Zi, Proof of Lemma 2] and [SZ]; that proof illustrates the idea of *the van Kampen embedding obstruction*. The topological van Kampen-Flores theorem has an alternative simple proof using the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem [Pr04, §10.3]. However, analogous proofs of the Menger conjecture are not known, so the proof we present is the simplest known proof. Linear, piecewise-linear and topological realizations are defined and discussed in §7.

Realizations are maps without self-intersections. For topological combinatorics and discrete geometry it is interesting to study maps whose intersections are 'not too complicated'. (Just as for study of smooth maps one needs to study maps whose singularities are 'not too complicated', i.e. to develop singularity theory.) Most known are maps *without triple intersections* and, more generally, maps *without r-tuple intersections*. In §8 we state some recent results in this direction: the Tverberg Theorem and a disproof (modulo an unpublished result) of the topological Tverberg Conjecture, obtained in 2015.

2 Formal statements of main results

Of the results stated here the Intersection Property 2.1, the Linking Property 2.3, the Intersection Property 2.4, the Product Theorem 2.6, Proposition 2.7 and the Square Theorem 2.8

Akhmetiev, Dušan Repovš and the author that there is no longer any copy of Galecki's dissertation (presumably containing a proof) available at the University of Tennessee. A proof was published in 2003 by Mikhail Skopenkov [Sk03]; it used 'lowering of the dimension' approach, see below, which is much simpler than Ummel's argument.

are proved in sections 2, 4, 5.1, 4.4, 4.4 and 5.2, respectively. In those sections we present interesting related results not directly required for proofs of main results. Results that are numbered but not named could be considered as remarks or exercises; hints to their proof are given either after the statement or at the end of the paper.

We use the following conventions. We abbreviate 'n-dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^n$' to 'n-space'. We mostly work with $n \leq 3$, and a reader can ignore the case $n > 4$. By k *points in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ we mean a k-element subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$; so these k points are assumed to be pairwise distinct.

2.1 Linking and intersection in the line and in the plane

A subset of the plane is *in general position*, if no 3 points of the subset belong to a line. [5]



Figure 3: Nonplanar graphs K_5 and $K_{3,3}$

Proposition 2.1 (Intersection Property)**.** *From any* 5 *points in the plane one can choose two disjoint pairs such that the segments with the vertices at these pairs intersect.* [6]

Moreover, if the 5 *points are in general position, then the number of intersection points of interiors of segments joining the points is odd.*

The first sentence is implied by the 'moreover' part because by a small shift one can put the points in general position without adding intersection points of segments with disjoint vertices.

Both the first sentence and the 'moreover' part is easily proved by analyzing the convex hull of the 5 points. [7] We present in §3 another proof based on reduction to the following obvious 1-dimensional result:

each 4 points in a line can be colored in red and blue so that their colors alternate along the line: red-blue-red-blue or blue-red-blue-red.

2.2 Linking in 3-space

A subset of 3-space is *in general position*, if no 4 points of the subset belong to one plane.

E.g. in general position are

• the set of points in Figure 4. (Consider a regular hexagon in a horizontal plane. Points A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, A_6 lye exactly above the vertices of the hexagon at the heights 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, respectively.)

• the set of points with *Cartesian coordinates* $(t; t^2; t^3)$, where $t \in (0, 1)$.

By a *triangle* we mean the convex hull of three points. So triangles are usually 2-dimensional (not always because we allow triangles to degenerate).

[5] Our definitions of general position are different from what is usually accepted in geometric problems, but are sufficient for our purposes.

[6] Of course this is a 'linear' version of the nonplanarity of the complete graph K_5 on 5 vertices, see Fig. 3, left, and §6.

[7] A subset of the plane or of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called *convex*, if for any two points from this subset the segment joining these two points is in this subset. The *convex hull* of a subset X of the plane or $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the minimal convex set that contains X.



Figure 4: A set of points in general position

Two triangles in 3-space whose six vertices are in general position are called *linked*, if the outline of the first triangle intersects the second triangle exactly at one point.

E.g. the triangles $A_1A_3A_5$ and $A_2A_4A_6$ in Figure 4 are linked.

The property of being linked is not symmetric a priori.

Lemma 2.2 (Symmetry)**.** *Triangles Δ and Δ' in 3-space are linked if and only if Δ' and Δ are linked.*

The proof is easy. (Hint: analogously to the Parity Lemma 3.2.a below consider $\Delta \cap \Delta'$.)

Theorem 2.3 (The Linear Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem; Linking Property)**.** *For any 6 general position points in 3-space there are two linked triangles with the vertices at these points.*

Moreover, the number of linked unordered pairs of triangles with vertices at these points is odd.

2.3 Linking and intersection in higher dimensions

A set of points in 4-space is in *general position*, if no 5 points from the set are in one 3-dimensional hyperplane. E.g., points $(t, t^2, t^3, t^4), t \in (0, 1)$, are in general position.

Theorem 2.4 (The Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem; Intersection Property)**.** *From any 7 points in 4-space one can choose two disjoint triples such that the triangles with the vertices at the triples intersect each other.*

Moreover, if the 7 points are in general position, then the number of intersection points of interiors of triangles with the vertices at these points is odd.

The first sentence is implied by the 'moreover' part because by a small shift one can put the points in general position without adding intersection points of triangles with disjoint vertices.

An analogue of Theorem 2.4

• is true for 5 points in the plane or 6 points in 3-space (see Intersection Properties 2.1 and 4.2.a below);

• is false for 4 points in the plane, 5 points in 3-space or 6 points in 4-space (in $\mathbb{R}^n$ take the $n+1$ vertices and an interior point of an n-simplex, see Figure 1, left).

The 'lowering of dimension' proofs of the above results suggest that they could be generalized to arbitrary dimensions. We present the generalization without defining higher-dimensional general position and linking.

Theorem 2.5 (Intersection and Linking)**.** *Take any $n+3$ general position points in $\mathbb{R}^n$.*

If n is even, then the number of intersection points of interiors of $n/2$-simplices with the vertices at these points is odd.

If n is odd, then the number of linked unordered pairs of $(n+1)/2$-simplices with the vertices at these points is odd.

This is proved by the induction on n. The base case $n = 1$ is trivial. The inductive step is proved below for $n = 2, 3, 4$, and the proof for the general case is analogous.

2.4 Realizability of products

An (m, n)-*product* is a collection of mn points A_{jp}, where $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, in 3- or 4-space, together with the collection of triangles

$$A_{jp}A_{kq}A_{jq} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{jp}A_{kq}A_{kp}, \quad \text{where} \quad 1 \le j < k \le m, \quad 1 \le p < q \le n.$$

Informally speaking, these two triangles are obtained by subdivision of the 'square' $jk \times pq$.

The union of triangles of (m, n)-product is a polyhedral (i.e. 'broken') and possibly self-intersecting

- square, if $m = n = 2$ (Fig. 2, left);
- lateral surface of a cylinder, if $m = 3$ and $n = 2$ (Fig. 2, middle);
- torus, if $m = n = 3$ (Fig. 2, right).

A typical example is the Cartesian product of m points in the plane and n points in the line (or in the plane).

Theorem 2.6 (Product Theorem)**.** *Any $(5, 3)$-product in 3-space has two triangles which have disjoint vertices but intersect.*

Proposition 2.7. *Any $(4, 4)$-product in 3-space has two triangles which have disjoint vertices but intersect.*

Theorem 2.8 (Square Theorem)**.** *Any $(5, 5)$-product in 4-space has two triangles which have disjoint vertices but intersect.*

Example 2.9. *The analogues of Theorems 2.6 and 2.8 are false for*

(a) $(2, n)$-products in 3-space for each n (for $n \le 4$ this is obvious; for $n = 5$ see Figure 1, right: the vertices of the parallelograms are the required 10 points; for $n \ge 6$ the construction is analogous, see §4.4; cf. [RSS95, Theorem 1.5]);

(b) $(3, n)$-products in 3-space for each $n \le 4$ (for $n \le 3$ this is obvious, see Figure 2, right; for $n = 4$ the construction is analogous, see §4.4);

(c) $(4, n)$-products in 4-space for each n (see §5.2).

3 Linking and intersection in the plane

3.1 Proof of the Intersection Property 2.1

Proof of the Intersection Property 2.1. For non-general-position points the property is obvious. Indeed, if points A, B, C among given 5 points belong to one line, B between A and C, and D is any other given point, then segments AC and BD intersect.

So assume that the given 5 points are in general position. We may assume that O is the unique point among given ones whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a line $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a. Denote A, B, C, D the other given 5 points so that they



Figure 5: To the proof of the Intersection Property 2.1; move D above.

are in the order A, B, C, D, if we look at them from the point O (see Figure 5). By the following Parity Lemma 3.1 some two sides of the triangles OAC and OBD have disjoint vertices but intersect.

The 'moreover' part follows by a simple additional counting (analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.3 in §4). QED

Lemma 3.1 (Parity Lemma)**.** *Assume that the outlines of two triangles in the plane intersect at a unique point, and a line sufficiently close to this point intersects the outlines by four distinct points. Then the points X, Y corresponding to one triangle are unlinked with the points Z, T corresponding to the other triangle, i.e. the segment XY contains either both or none of the points Z, T.*

This lemma is obvious. However, for the sake of non-obvious higher-dimensional generalizations we deduce it accurately from the following result. Cf. [BE82, §1]. Two broken lines in the plane are *in general position*, if

• each side of one of them and each side of the other either are disjoint or intersect at their common interior point;

• each two sides of one of them and each side of the other have no common point.

Notation. Denote by ∂T the outline of a triangle T. For a finite set S we denote by $|S|$ the number of elements of S. By $\underset{2}{\equiv}$ we denote congruence modulo 2.

Lemma 3.2 (Parity Lemma)**.** *(a) If the 6 vertices of two triangles in the plane are in general position, then their outlines intersect each other at an even number of points.*

(b) If the outline of a triangle and a closed broken line in the plane are in general position, then they intersect each other at an even number of points.

(c) Any two general position closed broken lines in the plane intersect each other at an even number of points. (This is already non-trivial because broken lines may have self-intersections.) [8]

Sketch of a proof. Part (a) follows because the outline of the first triangle comes into the second triangle as many times as it comes out. (The Jordan Theorem for a triangle is easy.)

Let us sketch an alternative proof of (a) which does not use any particular case of the Jordan Theorem and so can be generalized as required later. The intersection of the first triangle and the outline of the second triangle is a finite union of broken lines (non-degenerate to points). The outlines of the triangles intersect at the endpoints of the broken lines. The number of endpoints is even, so part (a) follows.

Part (b) can be proved analogously to (a). We present a different proof which generalize to a proof of (c). The proof is by reduction to (a), using *singular cone* idea which formalizes

[8] Выводить эту лемму из теоремы Жордана или формулы Эйлера неразумно, ибо доказательство формулы Эйлера использует теорему Жордана, а теоремы Жордана — аналогичную лемму о четности.

in a short way the *motion-to-infinity* idea. Denote by b the outline of the triangle. Take a point A which, together with the set of vertices of a or b, form a general position set. Then

$$|a \cap b| = \sum_{MN} |MN \cap b| \underset{2}{\equiv} \sum_{MN} |\partial(AMN) \cap b| \underset{2}{\equiv} 0.$$

Here the summation is over edges MN of a, and the last congruence follows by (a).

Part (c) is reduced to (b) analogously, just replace b by the second broken line, and take a point A such that $\partial(AMN)$ and b are in general position for each edge MN of a. QED

Proof of the Parity Lemma 3.1. Denote the point by O and the triangles by $OX'Y'$ and $OZ'T'$ (so that X, Y, Z, T are the intersection points of the line and OX', OY', OZ', OT', respectively). Let $a := \partial(OX'Y')$ and $b := \partial(OZ'T')$. The Lemma follows because

$$|XY \cap \{Z, T\}| = |XY \cap b| = |\partial(OXY) \cap b| - 1 \underset{2}{\equiv} |a \cap b| + |\partial(XYY'X') \cap b| - 1 \underset{2}{\equiv} 0.$$

Here the last congruence holds because $|a \cap b| = 1$ and by the Parity Lemma 3.2.b. QED

3.2 Some related results

Proposition 3.3 (Unlinking Property)**.** *(a) There are 5 general position points in the plane such that each segment joining two of these points intersects the outline of the triangle formed by the remaining points at an even number of points.*

(b) For each 5 general position points in the plane the number of those segments joining 2 of these points that intersect the outline of the triangle formed by the remaining 3 points at one point, is even.

The proof is easy and is left to a reader.

The following results are proved analogously to the Intersection Property 2.1 and Parity Lemma 3.2.

3.4. (Cf. figure 3, right.)

(a) Two triples of points are given in the plane. Then there exist two intersecting segments without common vertices and such that each segment joins the points from distinct triples.

(b) Assume that there are six points in general position in the plane. Split them into two triples $f_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $f_2 = \{4, 5, 6\}$. Clearly, for each two points $i, j \in f_1$ and two points $i', j' \in f_2$, the segments ii' and jj' either do not intersect or have only one intersection point. Prove that the number of intersection points (in the plane) of such segments is odd.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose that there are 4 red and 2 blue points in general position in the plane. Suppose further that any two segments joining points of different colors can only intersect at their common vertex. Then there is are two red points R_1, R_2 such that the segment joining the remaining two red points intersects broken line $R_1B_1R_2B_2$, where B_1 and B_2 are blue points, at an odd number of points. (If the broken line does not have self-intersections, this is equivalent to the remaining 2 red points lying on different sides of the broken line.)*

3.6. На плоскости имеется 14 точек: 7 красных и 7 желтых. Точки общего положения, т.е. никакие три не лежат на прямой и никакие три отрезка, их соединяющие, не имеют общей внутренней точки.

(a) Может ли количество точек пересечения красных отрезков (т.е. отрезков, соединяющих красные точки) и желтых отрезков быть равным 7?

(b) По красным отрезкам течет ток. Сумма токов, входящих в любую красную точку, равна сумме токов, из нее выходящих. По желтым отрезкам течет ток с выполнением того же правила Кирхгофа. Ориентируем каждый красный или желтый отрезок направлением тока, идущего по нему. В каждой точке пересечения ориентированных красного и желтого отрезков поставим произведение 'красного' и 'желтого' токов, если желтый ориентированный отрезок получается из красного вращением против часовой стрелки, и минус это произведение в противном случае. Могли ли так располагаться точки и течь токи, что сумма поставленных чисел (т.е. *поток красного тока через желтый*) равна 42A^2?

3.7. (a) A 2-cycle is defined in §4.4. Does the plane have a 2-cycle and a point not belonging to any edge of the triangle from the 2-cycle but belonging to exactly 7 triangles of the 2-cycle?

(b) Same question for the plane replaced by the sphere.

4 Linking and intersection in three-dimensional space

4.1 Weak versions of the Linear Conway-Gordon-Sachs Theorem

4.1. From any 6 points in 3-space one can choose 5 points O, A, B, C, D such that the triangles OAB and OCD have a common point other than O.

Sketch of a proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that there is a unique 'highest' point O among the given ones. Consider a 'horizontal' plane slightly below the point O. Consider the intersection of this plane with the union of triangles OAB for all pairs A, B of given points. Now the assertion follows by the Intersection Property 2.1. QED

Figure 1, left, shows that for 5 points an analogous assertion is not true.

The following improvement of Problem 4.1 is a spatial analogue of the Intersection Property 2.1 (without the 'moreover' part).

Proposition 4.2 (Intersection Property)**.** *From any 6 points in 3-space one can choose disjoint pair and triple such that the segment joining points of the pair intersects the triangle spanned by the triple.*

This result easily follows from Problem 4.1 (and from Theorem 2.3).

The spatial analogue of the 'moreover' part of the Intersection Property 2.1 fails (by the Unlinking Property 4.3.b below). So under the transition from dimension 2 to dimension 3 the existence of the intersection is preserved, while the parity of the number of intersections change.

Proposition 4.3 (Unlinking Property)**.** *(a) There are 6 general position points in 3-space such that each segment joining 2 of these points intersects the surface of the tetrahedron formed by the 4 remaining points at an even number of points.*

(b) For each 6 general position points in 3-space the number of those segments joining 2 of these points that intersect the surface of the tetrahedron formed by the remaining 4 points at one point, is even.

Hint to the proof. For (a) take points on a helix.

For (b) use the Symmetry Lemma 2.2 to prove that this number is twice the number considered in the 'moreover' part of Theorem 2.3.

4.2 Proof of the Linear Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem

Theorem 2.3 is reduced to the Intersection Property 2.1 using the following Projection Lemma 4.4. In 3-space *a segment p is below than a segment q looking from point O*, if there exists a half-line OX with the endpoint O that intersects the segment q at a point $P := p \cap OX$, the segment q at a point $Q := q \cap OX$, $P \neq Q$, so that Q is in the segment OP. Cf. Fig. 4, right.

Lemma 4.4 (The Projection Lemma)**.** *Assume that $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_6$ are general position points in 3-space. The triangles $A_1A_2A_3$ and $A_4A_5A_6$ are linked if and only if A_2A_3 is below, looking from A_1, exactly one side of the 'complementary' triangle $A_4A_5A_6$.*

Proof. Since the points $A_1, \ldots, A_6$ are in general position, the number of those sides of the triangle $A_4A_5A_6$ that are higher than A_2A_3 equals to the number of intersection points of the outline of the triangle $A_4A_5A_6$ with the triangle $A_1A_2A_3$. This implies the lemma. QED

Proof of the Linear Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem 2.3. We may assume that O is the unique point among given ones whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a plane $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a. Denote by $A'_1, \ldots, A'_5$ the intersection points of this plane and segments joining O to other given points. Since a segment cannot intersect a triangle by more than 2 points, in the Projection Lemma 4.4 'exactly one side' can be replaced by 'an odd number of sides'. Hence the following numbers are equal modulo 2:

- the number of linked unordered pairs of triangles formed by given points;
- the number of segments that pass below an odd number of sides of the 'complementary' triangles;
- the number of ordered pairs of segments of which the first passes below the second;
- the number of intersection points of segments whose vertices are $A'_1, \ldots, A'_5$.

By the Intersection Property 2.1 the latter number is odd. QED

4.3 Some related results

The following version of Theorem 2.3 is analogously reduced to Proposition 3.5.

Two closed quadrangular broken lines $ABCD$ and $A'B'C'D'$ in 3-space such that their 8 vertices are in general position are called *linked*, if the number of intersection points of the broken line $ABCD$ with the union of the triangles $A'B'C'$ and $A'D'C'$ is odd.

Theorem 4.5 (The Linear Sachs Theorem)**.** *[Sa81] Suppose that there are 4 red points and 4 blue points in 3-space such that any two line segments with the endpoints of different colors have no common interior points. Then there are two linked closed quadrangular broken lines with the vertices at these points consisting of edges with the endpoints of different colors.*

The following problems 4.6 and 4.7 clarify the notion of linking.

4.6. (a) Two points and a triangle in the plane are called *linked* if one of the points lies in the interior of the triangle, and the other — in the exterior.

Prove that two triangles in 3-space are linked if and only if the plane of the second triangle intersects the outline of the first triangle by two points linked with the second triangle.

(b) There are 4 points on a line, two red and two blue. The red and the bluer pairs of points are called *linked* if they alternate: red-blue-red-blue or blue-red-blue-red.

Prove that two triangles in 3-space are linked if and only if the common line of their planes intersects the outline of each triangle at two points, and these pairs of points are linked.

4.7. (a) Let A, B, C, X, Y, Z, Z' be 7 general position points in 3-space. If the outline of the triangle ABC intersects the union of triangles XZZ' and YZZ' at an even number of points, then the pairs ABC, XYZ and $ABC, X'YZ$ are either both linked or both unlinked. If the outline of the triangle ABC intersects the union of triangles XZZ' and YZZ' at an odd number of points, then exactly one of the pairs ABC, XYZ and $ABC, X'YZ$ is linked.

(For this we need the Parity Lemma 4.9.a of the following subsection.)

(b) If the vertices of two triangles in 3-space move continuously remaining in general position, then the triangles remain linked or unlinked. I.e. for each two triangles whose vertices are in general position there is $\delta > 0$ such that if we shift the vertices by δ, then the new vertices will be in general position and the new triangles are linked if and only if the old triangles are linked.

4.4 (m, n)-products in three-dimensional space

Given points A_{jp} as in the definition of (m, n)-product, denote by $jk \times pq$ the union of triangles $A_{jp}A_{kq}A_{jq}$ and $A_{jp}A_{kq}A_{kp}$ (which in the examples below is a plane quadrilateral).

Proof of Example 2.9.a. Let $(0, 0, 0), V, A_{11}, \dots A_{1n}$ be general position points in $\mathbb{R}^3$. For each $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote $A_{2p} := V + A_{1p}$. If V is close enough to $(0, 0, 0)$, then points A_{jp}, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $p \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, are as required.

Indeed, $12 \times pq$ is a parallelogram for each $p \neq q$. By general position, for any distinct p, q, r, s the segments $A_{1p}A_{1q}$ and $A_{1r}A_{1s}$ are disjoint. Since V is close enough to $(0, 0, 0)$, the same holds for 1 replaced by 2. Then any two parallelograms $12 \times pq$ and $12 \times rs$ without common sides are disjoint. Therefore points A_{jp} are as required. QED

Proof of Example 2.9.b. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ be the rotation through $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ w.r.t. x-axis. Let

$$(A_{11}, A_{12}, A_{13}, A_{14}) = ((1, 0, 1), (-1, 0, 1), (0, 0, 2), (0, 0, 3)).$$

Let $A_{2p} = f(A_{1p})$ and $A_{3p} = f(f(A_{1p}))$ for each $p \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Cf. Figure 2, right. Then points A_{jp}, $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $p \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, are as required.

Indeed, $jk \times pq$ is a rectangle for each $j \neq k, p \neq q$. Since every two segments joining points A_{1p} either are disjoint or intersect at a common vertex, such rectangles without common side are disjoint. Therefore points A_{jp} are as required. QED

Proof of Proposition 2.7. The proof is analogous to Problem 4.1 and Proposition 4.2. Assume to the contrary that no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect. By a small shift one can put the points in general position without adding intersection points of such triangles. So assume that the given 16 points A_{jk} are in general position. We may also assume that A_{14} is the unique point among them whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a plane $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a.

The intersection of the plane with the union of the triangles of the $(4, 4)$-product is the image of a linear map of the graph $K_{3,3}$ to the plane. Then by Problem 3.4.a there are $2 \leq j < k \leq 4$ and $1 \leq p < q \leq 3$ such that the triangles $A_{14}A_{1p}A_{j4}$ and $A_{14}A_{1q}A_{k4}$ have a common point other than A_{14}. Hence by general position, without loss of generality, segment $A_{1p}A_{j4}$ intersect triangle $A_{14}A_{1q}A_{k4}$. So the triangles $A_{jp}A_{1p}A_{j4}$ and $A_{14}A_{1q}A_{k4}$ have disjoint vertices but intersect. A contradiction. QED

Proof of the Product Theorem 2.6. Assume to the contrary that no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect. By a small shift one can put the points in general position without adding intersection points of such triangles. So assume that the given 15 points A_{jk} are in general position. We may also assume that A_{11} is the unique point among them whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a plane $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a.



Рис. 6: To the proof of the Product Theorem 2.6

For each $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$ color in red the intersection point of the plane with the segment $A_{11}A_{j1}$ (see Figure 6). For each $k = 2, 3$ color in blue the intersection point of the plane with the segment $A_{11}A_{1k}$. Clearly, the 6 colored points in the plane are in general position. Since no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect, any two segments joining points of different colors can only intersect at their common vertex. Hence by Proposition 3.5 there are 2 red points R_1, R_2 such that the segment joining the remaining two red points R_3, R_4 intersects broken line $R_1B_1R_2B_2$, where B_1 and B_2 are blue points, at an odd number of points. Without loss of generality, R_1, B_1, R_2, B_2 belong to the segments joining A_{11} to $A_{21}, A_{12}, A_{31}, A_{13}$, respectively, and R_3, R_4 belong to the segments joining A_{11} to A_{41}, A_{51}, respectively.

Then the points R_3 and R_4 are intersection points of the plane and the triangle $A_{11}A_{41}A_{51}$. The broken line $R_1B_1R_2B_2$ is the intersection of the plane and the torus 'formed' by A_{ij}, $1 \le i, j \le 3$. Since the points are in general position, A_{11} is the unique intersection point of the triangle and the torus. This contradicts the following Parity Lemma 4.8. QED

4.5 Parity Lemmas

A *2-cycle* is a collection of (different) triangles such that each segment is the side of an even number (possibly, zero) of triangles from the collection. *The vertices* of a 2-cycle are the vertices of its triangles. *The body* of a 2-cycle is the union of its triangles.

An example of a 2-cycle is the surface of a tetrahedron (possibly, degenerate).

A broken line and a 2-cycle in 3-space are in *general position*, if

• each side of the broken line and each triangle of the 2-cycle either are disjoint or intersect at their common interior point;

• each two triangles (or sides) of one of them and each side (or triangle) of the other have no common point.

Lemma 4.8 (Parity Lemma)**.** *Assume that a broken line and the body of a 2-cycle in 3-space intersect at a unique point, which is their common vertex, and a plane sufficiently close to this point intersects the broken line and the 2-cycle by two points and by a broken line, respectively. Then the two points intersect the broken line by an even number of points.*

This is deduced from the following Parity Lemma 4.9.b analogously to the Parity Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 4.9 (Parity Lemma)**.** *(a) If the outline of a triangle and the surface of a tetrahedron in 3-space are in general position, then they intersect at an even number of points.*

(b) If a broken line and a 2-cycle in 3-space are in general position, then the broken line intersects the body of the 2-cycle at an even number of points.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the Parity Lemma 3.2.

Part (a) follows because the intersection of the triangle and the surface of the tetrahedron is a finite union of broken lines. It has an even number of endpoints corresponding to the required intersection points.

(Alternatively, observe that the plane of the triangle intersects the surface of the tetrahedron by a union of closed broken lines, and use the Parity Lemma 3.2.b.)

Part (b) for the case when the 2-cycle b is the surface of a tetrahedron is reduced to (a) as in the Parity Lemma 3.2.b. Point A is *in general position* to b and the broken line a (define general position required for the proof!).

The general case of part (b) is reduced to the particular case analogously, just replace b by the 2-cycle and modify definition of a general position. QED

4.10. *Эта задача предлагалась 1.04.2015 на ФОПФ МФТИ в курсе 'Современные топологические методы в физике'.*

В трехмерном пространстве имеется 17 точек: 7 красных и 10 желтых. Точки общего положения, т.е. никакие четыре не лежат в одной плоскости и никакой красный отрезок (т.е. отрезок, соединяющий красные точки) не пересекает прямой пересечения плоскостей желтых треугольников (т.е. треугольников, натянутых на желтые точки).

(a) Может ли количество точек пересечения красных отрезков и желтых треугольников быть равным 7?

(b) После решения пункта (a) Илья Муромец подошел к точкам поближе.

Он увидел, что по красным отрезкам течет ток. Чу! Сколько в красную точку миллиампер входит, столько из нее и выходит.

А по ориентированным желтым треугольникам свистит *свист*. Т.е. на каждом ориентированном желтом треугольнике стоит соловьёметр, измеряющий свист в Соловьях ($1\text{C}=1\text{A}^2$). Чу! Сколько в ориентированный желтый отрезок микросоловьев входит, столько из него и выходит. (Ориентированный треугольник ABC *входит* в ориентированный отрезок AB и *выходит* из ориентированного отрезка BA.)

В каждой точке пересечения красного отрезка и желтого треугольника стоит гривнометр. По закону Владимира-Красное-Солнышко показание гривнометра равно произведению показаний соответствующих амперметра и соловьёметра, если направление красного тока и ориентация желтого треугольника согласованы по правилу *левой руки* (*буравчика*), и минус этому произведению, если не согласованы. (Таким образом, $1\text{ Грн}=1\text{C}\times1\text{A}=1\text{A}^3$.)

За понимание условия пункта (b) князь одарил Илью величиной *потока тока через свист*, т.е., суммой показаний гривнометров. Могли ли так располагаться точки, течь ток по красным отрезкам и свистеть свист по желтым треугольникам, что Илье хватило на новую стрелу?

Примечание. Стрела стоит Илье 42 наногривны, если летит от него, и -42 наногривны, если летит в него.

5 Linking and intersection in four-dimensional space

5.1 The Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem 2.4

Proposition 5.1 (Unlinking Property)**.** *(a) There are 7 general position points in 4-space such that each triangle formed by three of these points intersects the surface of the tetrahedron formed by the remaining points at an even number of points.*

(b) Assume that 7 general position points in 4-space are given. For each triangle formed by three of these points count the number of intersection points of this triangle and the surface of the tetrahedron formed by the remaining points. Then the sum of these numbers is even.

Cf. the Unlinking Properties 3.3, 4.3, and the Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem 2.4.

The following informal comment to the proof of Theorem 2.4 was suggested by O. Viro. The reason why certain 2-dimensional polyhedra are not embeddable in 4-space is that they contain many 2-cycles organized in such a way that one can find a pair of disjoint 2-cycles which must have odd intersection under the embedding. This is impossible, because in 4-space the *homology group* (and hence the *intersection form*) is trivial.



Рис. 7: To the proof of Theorem 2.4. A hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^4$ (shown as a plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$) intersects the segments $A_1A_2, A_1A_3, \ldots, A_1A_7$ by 6 points which are vertices of two linked triangles.

Proof of the Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem 2.4. Assume to the contrary that no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect. As in the proof of the Product Theorem 2.6, we may assume that the given 7 points $A_1, A_2 \ldots, A_7$ are in general position and that A_1 is the unique point among them whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a 3-dimensional hyperplane $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a.

Take the 6 intersection points of the hyperplane with the segments $A_1A_2, A_1A_3, \ldots, A_1A_7$; see Figure 7. Clearly, the obtained 6 points are in general position in the hyperplane. Hence by the Linear Conway–Gordon–Sachs Theorem 2.3 there are two linked outlines of triangles with the vertices at these points. Without loss of generality, the vertices of the first triangle belong to the segments joining A_1 to A_2, A_3, A_4, and the vertices of the second triangle belong to the segments joining A_1 to A_5, A_6, A_7.

The above outlines of triangles are the intersections of surfaces of tetrahedra $A_1A_2A_3A_4$ and $A_1A_5A_6A_7$ with the hyperplane. Since the given 7 points are in general position, any two triangles having one common vertex intersect only at the vertex. Since no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect, this implies that A_1 is the unique intersection point of the surfaces of the tetrahedra $A_1A_2A_3A_4$ and $A_1A_5A_6A_7$. This contradicts the following Parity Lemma 5.2.

The 'moreover' part follows by a simple additional counting (analogous to the proof of Theorem 2.3 in §4) using the 'moreover' part of Theorem 2.3. QED

Lemma 5.2 (Parity Lemma)**.** *Assume that the surfaces of two tetrahedra in 4-space intersect at a unique point, and a hyperplane sufficiently close to this point intersects the surfaces by outlines of two triangles whose vertices are in general position. Then the triangles are not linked in the hyperplane.*

This lemma (and the Parity Lemma 5.3 below) is not as obvious as its low-dimensional analogues because *the surface of a tetrahedron does not split 4-space*. However, this lemma is

deduced from the following Parity Lemma 5.3.b analogously to the Parity Lemmas 3.1 and 4.8 (more formal exposition is given in [Zu]).

Two 2-cycles in 4-space are in *general position*, if

• each triangle of the one of them and each triangle of the other either are disjoint or intersect at their common interior point;

• each two triangles of one of them and each triangle of the other have no common point.

Lemma 5.3 (Parity Lemma)**.** *(a) If the surfaces of two tetrahedra in 4-space are in general position, then they intersect at an even number of points.*

(b) If two 2-cycles in 4-space are in general position, then their bodies intersect at an even number of points.

The proof is analogous to the Parity Lemmas 3.2 and 4.9.

The following result is proved analogous to the Linear Van Kampen-Flores Theorem 2.4.

Proposition 5.4. *Three triples of points in 4-space are given. Then there exist two intersecting triangles without common vertices such that the vertices of each triangle belong to distinct triples.*

5.2 (m, n)-products in four-dimensional space

Sketch of the proof of a weaker version of Example 2.9.c: $(3, 5)$*-product in 4-space.* See Fig. 8, left. Take a (three-dimensional) hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^4$ (shown as a plane in three-dimensional space). In this hyperplane take 10 vertices A_{jp}, where $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $p \in \{1, 2\}$, shown in Figure 1, right. Take a vector v not parallel to the hyperplane. Set $A_{j3} := A_{j1} + v$. In the picture we see the lateral surface of the prismoid $A_{41}A_{42}A_{43}A_{51}A_{52}A_{53}$.



Рис. 8: Left: to realization in $\mathbb{R}^4$ of the *product* of the complete graphs on 5 and on 3 vertices. Right: to realization in $\mathbb{R}^4$ of the *product* of the complete graphs on 5 and on 4 vertices.

Sketch of the proof of Example 2.9.c. See Fig. 8, right. Take points $A_{jp} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ from the proof of Example 2.9.a. Then $\overrightarrow{A_{1p}A_{1q}} = \overrightarrow{A_{2p}A_{2q}}$ for each $p \neq q$. For vectors $v_3, v_4 \in \mathbb{R}^4$ denote $A_{jp} := A_{1p} + v_j$, $j \in \{3, 4\}$. One can check that the points A_{jp}, $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, are as required, if vectors v_3, v_4 are not parallel to the hyperplane $\mathbb{R}^3 \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ and such that A_{14} is the interior point of the triangle $A_{11}A_{12}A_{13}$. QED

Proof of the Square Theorem 2.8. Assume to the contrary that no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect. As in the proof of the Product Theorem 2.6, we may assume that the given 25 points are in general position and that A_{11} is the unique point among them whose first coordinate a is maximal. Consider a 3-dimensional hyperplane $x = b$, where b is slightly smaller than a.

For each $i = 2, 3, 4, 5$ color in red the intersection point of the hyperplane with the segment $A_{11}A_{1i}$; see Figure 9. For each $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$ color in blue the intersection point of



Рис. 9: To the proof of the Square Theorem 2.8.

the hyperplane with the segment $A_{11}A_{j1}$. Clearly, the 8 colored points in the hyperplane are in general position. Hence by the Linear Sachs Theorem 4.5 there are two linked closed quadrangular broken lines whose vertices are the colored points and whose edges have endpoints of different colors. Without loss of generality, the vertices of the first broken line belong to the segments joining A_{11} to $A_{12}, A_{21}, A_{13}, A_{31}$, and the vertices of the second broken line belong to the segments joining A_{11} to $A_{14}, A_{41}, A_{15}, A_{51}$.

Denote by T_{pqr} the union of triangles

$$A_{ik}A_{il}A_{jk} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{jl}A_{jk}A_{il}, \quad \text{where} \quad i \in \{p,q,r\}, \quad j \in \{p,q,r\}.$$

Clearly, this is the body of a 2-cycle. (This is actually a polyhedral torus which could have self-intersections.) The broken lines are the intersections of T_{123} and T_{145} with the hyperplane. Since the given 25 points are in general position and no two triangles with disjoint vertices intersect, analogously to the proof of Theorem 2.4, A_{11} is the unique intersection point of T_{123} and T_{145}. This contradicts the following Parity Lemma 5.5. QED

Lemma 5.5 (Parity Lemma)**.** *Assume that the bodies of two 2-cycles in 4-space intersect at a unique point, and a hyperplane sufficiently close to the point intersects the bodies by a pair of quadrangular broken lines whose vertices are in general position. Then the broken lines are not linked in the hyperplane.*

This lemma is deduced from Parity Lemma 5.3.b analogously to the Parity Lemmas 3.1, 4.8 and 5.2, see details in [Zu].

6 Realizability of graphs

6.1 Embedded sets of segments

A set of segments in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (e.g. in the plane or in 3-space) is called *embedded*, if each two of them either are disjoint or intersect only at a common vertex.

E.g., vertices of a triangle and a point inside it are 4 points in the plane such that the set of all the segments joining them is embedded. The Intersection Property 2.1 shows that no 5 points with this property exist. However, there are 5 points in the plane such that the set of all but one segments joining the points is embedded.

6.1 (General Position Theorem)**.** For each n there exist n points in 3-space such that the set of all the segments joining the points is embedded.

The following corollary of the Intersection Property 2.1 illustrate some ideas of the proof of Theorem 7.10.c.

6.2. Для любых пяти точек 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 на плоскости если набор отрезков

(a) jk, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $k \ne 2$, вложенный, то точки 1 и 2 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 345;

(b) jk, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $(j,k) \notin \{(1,2),(1,3)\}$, вложенный то

ЛИБО точки 1 и 2 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 345,

ЛИБО точки 1 и 3 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 245.

(c) jk, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $(j,k) \notin \{(1,2),(1,3),(1,4)\}$, вложенный, то

ЛИБО точки 1 и 2 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 345,

ЛИБО точки 1 и 3 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 245,

ЛИБО точки 1 и 4 находятся по разные стороны от треугольника 235.

(d) Ой... Вы уже догадались, как формулируется эта задача и вообще как при изучении вложимости возникают булевы функции.

6.2 Linear realization of graphs

Recall that a *graph* (V, E) is a collection E of two-element subsets of a finite set V. [9] Элементы данного конечного множества называются *вершинами*. Выделенные пары вершин называются *ребрами*. Общепринятый термин для понятия графа, данного здесь — *граф без петель и кратных ребер* или *простой граф*.

Граф с n вершинами, любые две из которых соединены ребром, называется *полным* и обозначается K_n. Через $K_{m,n}$ обозначается *полный двудольный граф* с долями из m и из n вершин: в нем имеются все ребра между вершинами разных долей. См. рис. 3.

A *linear realization* of graph (V, E) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is an embedded set of segments in $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose vertices correspond to V and whose segments correspond to E. E.g.

• neither K_5 nor $K_{3,3}$ is linearly realizable in the plane (by the Intersection Property 2.1 and Problem 3.4);

• each graph is linearly realizable in 3-space (by Theorem 6.1).

6.3. There is an algorithm for recognition of linear realizability of graphs in the plane.

A criterion for linear realizability of graphs in the plane follows from the Kuratowski and the Fary Theorems 6.4 and 6.5 below.

6.3 Definition of homeomorphic graphs and the body

Неформально, *тело* $|G|$ графа G — фигура, полученная из конечного числа отрезков отождествлением некоторых их концов в соответствии с графом. Формально, *телом* графа называется объединение отрезков любого вложенного семейства отрезков, соответствующих ребрам графа, концы которых соответствуют вершинам графа. Один граф имеет много разных тел. Например, параллельный перенос тела дает другое тело. Обратно, одна фигура может быть телом нескольких графов. Все такие графы гомеоморфны, см. далее.

Операция *подразделения ребра* графа показана на рис. 10. Два графа называются *гомеоморфными*, если от одного можно перейти к другому при помощи операций подразделения ребра и обратных к ним. Это эквивалентно существованию графа, который можно получить из каждого из данных графов операциями подразделения ребра.

[9] Графы G_1 и G_2 называются *изоморфными*, если существует взаимно однозначное отображение f множества V_1 вершин графа G_1 на множество V_2 вершин графа G_2, удовлетворяющее следующему условию: *вершины* $A, B \in V_1$ *соединены ребром в том и только в том случае, если вершины* $f(A), f(B) \in V_2$ *соединены ребром.*



Рис. 10: Подразделение ребра

Пусть $N \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ и $Y \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. [10] Отображение $f : N \to Y$ называется *непрерывным*, если для любых $x \in N$ и $\varepsilon > 0$ существует такое $\delta > 0$, что при любых $y \in N$ с условием $|x - y| < \delta$ выполнено $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$. Если N замкнуто и ограничено, то это условие равносильно следующему условию *равномерной непрерывности*: для любого $\varepsilon > 0$ существует такое $\delta > 0$, что при любых $x, y \in N$ с условием $|x - y| < \delta$ выполнено $|f(x) - f(y)| < \varepsilon$. Два подмножества евклидова пространства $\mathbb{R}^d$ называются *гомеоморфными*, если существуют взаимно-обратные непрерывные отображения между ними. Нетрудно сообразить, что *любые два тела одного графа гомеоморфны.* Оказывается, что *графы гомеоморфны тогда и только тогда, когда их тела гомеоморфны.* Этот критерий является *мотивировкой* для определения гомеоморфности графов, которое позволяет перевести изучение некоторых фигур на чисто комбинаторный язык.

Одномерным полиэдром называется класс гомеоморфности графов. Топологу интересны именно полиэдры (часто тополог называет их графами). Но графы и тела — удобные средства изучения полиэдров и хранения их в памяти компьютера. А комбинаторщику и дискретному геометру интересны графы и тела. Но и полиэдры оказываются для них полезными.

6.4 Planarity of graphs

Граф называется *планарным* (или кусочно-линейно вложимым в плоскость), если его можно без самопересечений нарисовать на плоскости так, чтобы ребра изображались ломаными. Или, формально, если некоторый граф, гомеоморфный данному, линейно вложим в плоскость.

Непланарность графов K_5 и $K_{3,3}$ доказывается аналогично утверждениям 2.1 и 3.4.а.

Грубо говоря, *подграф* данного графа — это его часть. Формально, граф G называется *подграфом* графа H, если каждая вершина графа G является вершиной графа H, и каждое ребро графа G является ребром графа H. (При этом две вершины графа G, соединенные ребром в графе H, не обязательно соединены ребром в графе G.)

Theorem 6.4 (Kuratowski)**.** *Граф планарен тогда и только тогда, когда он не содержит подграфа, гомеоморфного графу K_5 или $K_{3,3}$ (рис. 3).*

Theorem 6.5 (Fary)**.** *Если граф планарен (т.е., кусочно-линейно вложим в плоскость), то он линейно вложим в плоскость.*

Из теорем Куратовского или Фари вытекает существование алгоритма распознавания планарности графов. А вот следующий результат уже не вытекает из них.

Theorem 6.6 (Hopcroft-Tarjan)**.** *Существует линейный по количеству вершин алгоритм распознавания планарности графов.*

[10] Читатель может пропустить этот абзац и нижеследующие теоремы 7.9, 7.12 без ущерба для понимания остального материала.

7 Linear realizability of hypergraphs

7.1 Embedded sets of triangles

A set of non-degenerate triangles in d-space $\mathbb{R}^d$ is *embedded*, if each two of them either are disjoint, or intersect only at a common vertex, or intersect only by a common side.

E.g., in Figure 1, left, one can see 5 points in 3-space such that the set of all triangles with the vertices at these points is embedded. By Theorem 2.3 or Problem 4.1 or the Intersection Property 4.2, no 6 points with this property exist.

E.g., 5 vertices of 4-dimensional simplex and a point inside it are 6 points in 4-space such that the set of all triangles with vertices at these points is embedded. Theorem 2.4 shows that no 7 points with this property exist.

7.1. (a) There exist 6 points in 3-space such that the set of all but one triangles with the vertices at these points is embedded.

(b) Suppose that we have 5 points in 3-space. If the set of all triangles with vertices at these points is embedded, then for each point of space one of the 5 interiors of segments joining this point and one of the given points intersects at least one triangle with vertices at given points.



Рис. 11: $\mathbb{R}^4$ is shown as $\mathbb{R}^3$ and a (3-dimensional) hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^4$ is shown as a 2-dimensional plane in $\mathbb{R}^3$

In the rest of this subsection we denote points in $\mathbb{R}^3$ (and in $\mathbb{R}^4$) by numbers.

7.2. (a) There are 7 points in 4-space such that the set of all but one triangles spanned by these points is embedded.

(b) For each n there exist $n+1$ points $0, 1, \dots, n \in \mathbb{R}^4$ such that the set of all the triangles $0jk$, $1 \le j < k \le n$, is embedded. (Hint: Figure 11.)

7.3 (General Position Theorem)**.** For each n there exist n points in $\mathbb{R}^5$ such that the set of all the triangles spanned by the points is embedded.

The following corollaries of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4 illustrate some ideas of the proof of Theorem 7.10.c.

7.4. For any 6 points $0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ in 3-space, if the set of triangles

(a) $0jk$, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $k \ne 2$, together with segment 12, is embedded, then the triangles 012 and 345 are linked.

(b) $0jk$, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $(j,k) \notin \{(1,2),(1,3)\}$, together with segments 12 and 13, is embedded, then either the triangles 012 and 345, or the triangles 013 and 245, are linked.

(c) $0jk$, $1 \le j < k \le 5$, $(j,k) \notin \{(1,2),(1,3),(1,4)\}$, together with segments 12, 13 and 14 is embedded, then either the triangles 012 and 345, or the triangles 013 and 245, or the triangles 014 and 235 are linked.

(d) Dare you to guess the statement!

7.5. For any 7 points $1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$ in 4-space, if the set of triangles

(a) ijk, $1 \le i < j < k \le 5$, $k \ne 3$, is embedded, then the triangle 123 and tetrahedron 4567 are linked.

(b,c,d) Dare you to guess the statements!

7.2 Linear realization of hypergraphs

Recall that a *three-homogeneous hypergraph* (shortly: *2-hypergraph*) (V, F) is a collection F of three-element subsets of a finite set V. (Определение изоморфизма 2-гиперграфов аналогично случаю графов.)

A *linear realization* of 2-hypergraph (V, F) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is an embedded set of triangles in $\mathbb{R}^d$ whose vertices correspond to V and whose triangles correspond to F. At the beginning of this section we have shown that

• the complete 2-hypergraph on 5 vertices is linear realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$;

• the complete 2-hypergraph on 6 vertices is not linear realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and is linear realizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$;

• the complete 2-hypergraph on 7 vertices is not linear realizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$;

• each 2-hypergraph is linear realizable in $\mathbb{R}^5$ (by Theorem 7.3).

7.6. There is an algorithm for recognition of linear realizability of 2-hypergraphs in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for each $d = 2, 3, 4$.

7.3 Linear realizability of products

The *product* $K_m \times K_n$ is the 2-hypergraph on mn vertices A_{jp}, where $j \in \{1, 2 \dots, m\}$, $p \in \{1, 2 \dots, n\}$, consisting of all three-element sets of the form

$$\{A_{jp}, A_{kq}, A_{jq}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{A_{jp}, A_{kq}, A_{kp}\}, \quad \text{where} \quad 1 \le j < k \le m, \quad 1 \le p < q \le n.$$

For instance, the products

$$K_2 \times K_2, \quad K_2 \times K_3, \quad K_3 \times K_3, \quad K_2 \times K_5, \quad K_5 \times K_3, \quad \text{and} \quad K_5 \times K_4$$

are shown in Figures 2, left (a *square*), 2, right (a *torus*), 2, middle (a *cylinder*) 1, right (a *cylinder over* K_5), 8, left and 8, right, respectively.

A linear realization of $K_m \times K_n$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is an (m, n)-product in $\mathbb{R}^d$ (defined before Theorem 2.6) whose triangles form an embedded set. Hence Theorems 2.6, 2.8 and Proposition 2.7 imply that the products $K_5 \times K_3$, $K_4 \times K_4$ and $K_5 \times K_5$ are not linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$, in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and in $\mathbb{R}^4$, respectively. Presumably an (m, n)-product in which triangles having disjoint vertices are disjoint need not be a linear realization of $K_m \times K_n$. However, Example 2.9 generalizes to show that

(a) the product $K_2 \times K_n$ is linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for each n;

(b) the product $K_3 \times K_n$ is linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$ for each $n \le 4$;

(c) the product $K_4 \times K_n$ is linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$ for each n. [11]

All this implies that

[11] *Sketch of a proof.* For (a) this follows because in the construction in §4.4

• for any $1 \le p < q \le n$ the triangles $A_{1p}A_{2q}A_{2p}$ and $A_{1p}A_{2q}A_{1q}$ intersect exactly by the common side and lie in the parallelogram $12 \times pq$.

• since points $(0, 0, 0), V, A_{11}, \dots A_{1n}$ are in general position, if parallelograms $12 \times pq$ and $12 \times rs$ have a common point, then they intersect by a common side.

For (b) and (c) the realizability improvement is checked analogously. QED

the product $K_m \times K_n$ is linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^3$ if and only if either $\min\{m,n\} = 2$ *or or* $m = n = 3$ *or* $\{m,n\} = \{3,4\}$.

the product $K_m \times K_n$ is linearly realizable in $\mathbb{R}^4$ if and only if $\min\{m,n\} \leq 4$.

Theorem 7.7. *Let $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ be connected graphs, not homeomorphic to point, K_2 and K_3. The minimal dimension d such that $G_1 \times \ldots \times G_n \times (S^1)^s \times I$ is linearly (or PL or TOP, se below) realizable in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is*

$$\begin{cases} 2n+s+i & \text{if either } i \neq 0 \text{ or some } G_k \text{ is planar} \\ 2n+s+1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

7.4 Definition of homeomorphic hypergraphs and the body



Рис. 12: Построение тела 2-комплекса

Как и по графу, по 2-гиперграфу естественно строится геометрическая фигура, называемая его *телом*. Неформально говоря, она получена склейкой треугольников, соответствующих граням 2-гиперграфа. Склейка осуществляется не обязательно в трехмерном пространстве: либо в многомерном пространстве, либо даже абстрактно, независимо от объемлющего пространства. Например, на рис. 12 изображено построение тела полного 2-гиперграфа с 4 вершинами.

Формально, *телом* 2-гиперграфа называется объединение треугольников любого вложенного семейства треугольников, соответствующих граням 2-гиперграфа, вершины которых соответствуют вершинам 2-гиперграфа.



Рис. 13: Подразделения ребра и грани

Операция *подразделения ребра* изображена на рис. 13 слева.

7.8. Операция *подразделения грани* на рис. 13 справа выражается через операцию подразделения ребра.

Два 2-гиперграфа называются *гомеоморфными*, если от одного можно перейти к другому при помощи операций подразделения ребра и обратных к ним.

Theorem 7.9. *2-гиперграфы гомеоморфны тогда и только тогда, когда их тела гомеоморфны.*

Definition of an *n-homogeneous hypergraph* (shortly: *n-hypergraph*) is analogous to the cases $n = 1, 2$. Заметим, что аналог части 'только тогда' теоремы 7.9 верен и для n-гиперграфов, а аналог части 'тогда' неверен для n-гиперграфов при $n \geq 5$. A counterexample is the 5-sphere and *the double suspension of the Poincaré homology 3-sphere*.

Двумерным полиэдром называется класс гомеоморфности 2-гиперграфа.

Для гиперграфов справедливы замечания, аналогичные сделанным в п. 6 по поводу тела графа и гомеоморфности графов.

7.5 Piecewise-linear realizability of hypergraphs

2-гиперграф называется *PL (кусочно-линейно) вложимым* в $\mathbb{R}^d$, если некоторый гомеоморфный ему 2-гиперграф линейно вложим в $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Ясно, что из линейной вложимости 2-гиперграфа в $\mathbb{R}^d$ вытекает его PL вложимость в $\mathbb{R}^d$. Обратное верно для $d = 2$ и неверно для $d \in \{3, 4\}$. Для $d = 2$ это теорема Фари 6.5. Для $d = 3$ это доказано в [vK41] (см. также [MTW11, §2], [PW]), а для $d = 4$ это вытекает из нижеследующей теоремы 7.10.c (см. также [MTW11, §2]). Тем не менее, результаты из п. 7 о линейной невложимости верны и для PL невложимости; доказательства аналогичны и используют PL аналоги лемм о четности.

Существование алгоритма распознавания планарности 2-гиперграфов вытекает из аналога теоремы Фари 6.5 и задачи 7.6 для $d = 2$ (а также из критерия типа Куратовского планарности 2-гиперграфов, т.е. из теоремы Халина-Юнга; этот критерий удобнее формулировать на языке *2-комплексов*).

Theorem 7.10. *(a) Существует линейный по количеству вершин алгоритм распознавания PL вложимости 2-гиперграфов в плоскость. [MTW11, Appendix A]*

(b) Существует алгоритм распознавания PL вложимости 2-гиперграфов в $\mathbb{R}^3$. [MSTW14]

(c) Алгоритмическая проблема распознавания PL вложимости 2-гиперграфов в $\mathbb{R}^4$ является NP-трудной. [MTW11]

Общепринятое формальное определение NP-трудности непросто. Приведем следующее эквивалентное определение. Алгоритмическая проблема, зависящая от целочисленного параметра n, называется *NP-трудной*, если, имея автомат для ее решения за 1 шаг, можно построить полиномиальный по n алгоритм распознавания тождественности нулю булевой формулы от n переменных, являющейся дизъюнкцией конъюнкций переменных и их отрицаний (например, $f(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = x_1x_2\overline{x}_3 \vee \overline{x}_2x_3x_4 \vee \overline{x}_1x_2x_4$).

В [Sk, п. 4.10 'Идея доказательства теоремы об NP-трудности'] некоторые идеи доказательства теоремы 7.10.c проиллюстрированы на трехмерных примерах.

Conjecture 7.11. *(a) Алгоритмическая проблема распознавания PL вложимости 2-гиперграфов в $\mathbb{R}^3$ является NP-трудной.*

(b) Существует алгоритм распознавания PL вложимости 2-гиперграфов в $\mathbb{R}^4$.

7.6 Topological realizability of hypergraphs

2-гиперграф называется *топологически вложимым* в $\mathbb{R}^d$, если существует неперывное инъективное отображение в $\mathbb{R}^d$ некоторого его тела.

Ясно, что из PL вложимости 2-гиперграфа в $\mathbb{R}^d$ вытекает его топологическая вложимость в $\mathbb{R}^d$. Обратное верно для $d \neq 4$ [Br72, Mo77] и, по-видимому, неверно для $d = 4$.

A topological embedding can be approximated by a PL map for which images of disjoint simplices are disjoint. The PL versions of the above proofs of non-realizability actually show that no such maps exist. So they show topological non-embeddability in $\mathbb{R}^4$ (of the hypergraphs considered).

Let us present an alternative construction and proof that uses the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem.

Theorem 7.12. *There exists a 2-hypergraph that does not topologically embed into* $\mathbb{R}^4$.



Рис. 14: A contraction

Proof. We present a simplified proof invented by E. Schepin, D. Repovs and the author (and, possibly, others) [RS01], [Sk08, §5].

Let T be a *triod*, i.e., the graph with four vertices O, A, B, C and three edges OA, OB and OC. The product T^3 is a cone over some 2-polyhedron N. In other words, N is the join of 3 copies of a three-point set, cf. Theorem 5.4.

In order to prove that N does not embed into $\mathbb{R}^4$ it suffices to prove that T^3 does not embed into $\mathbb{R}^5$. Suppose to the contrary that there is an embedding $f : T^3 \to \mathbb{R}^5$. Let $p : D^2 \to T$ be a map which does not identify any antipodes of $S^1 = \partial D^2$ (e.g. the map from Figure 14). It is easy to check that the map $p^3|_{\partial D^6} : \partial D^6 \to T^3$ also does not identify any antipodes. Then the composition of p^3 and f again does not identify antipodes. This contradicts the Borsuk-Ulam Theorem. QED

Further generalizations can be found, e.g., in [Sk, 4.5 'Кусочно-линейные вложения комплексов'] [Sk03, ARS01].

8 Rado and Tverberg Theorems

Следующий материал разумно сначала разобрать для $d = 2, 3, 4$.

8.1. (a) Для любого d существуют такие $d + 1$ точка в $\mathbb{R}^d$, при любом разбиении которых на два множества выпуклые оболочки множеств не пересекаются.

(b) **Теорема Радона.** *Для любого d любые $d + 2$ точки в $\mathbb{R}^d$ можно разбить на два множества, выпуклые оболочки которых пересекаются.*

(Имеется доказательство при помощи индукции по размерности, как и для результатов из §2.)

8.2. (3') Вершины любого выпуклого 100-угольника на плоскости можно так раскрасить в 3 цвета, что 3 (двумерных) выпуклых многоугольника, образованных вершинами каждого цвета, имеют общую точку.

(3)* Любые 100 точек на плоскости можно так раскрасить в 3 цвета, что 3 (двумерных) выпуклых многоугольника, образованных вершинами каждого цвета, имеют общую точку.

(3,6) Существуют 6 точек на плоскости, при любом разбиении которых на три множества выпуклые оболочки множеств не имеют общей точки.

(3,7) Любые 7 точек на плоскости можно разбить на три множества так, что выпуклые оболочки множеств имеют общую точку.

(r) Для любого r существует такое N, что любые N точек на плоскости можно так разбить на r множеств, что выпуклые оболочки множеств имеют общую точку.

(r,3r-3) Аналог п. (r) неверен для $N = 3r - 3$.

(r,3r-2)* Аналог п. (r) верен для $N = 3r - 2$.

8.3. (a) Для любого d существуют $2d+2$ точки в $\mathbb{R}^d$, при любом разбиении которых на три множества выпуклые оболочки множеств не имеют общей точки.

(b)* Для любого d любые $2d + 3$ точки в $\mathbb{R}^d$ можно разбить на три множества, выпуклые оболочки которых имеют общую точку.

8.4. Для любых d, r существуют $(d + 1)(r - 1)$ точки в $\mathbb{R}^d$, при любом разбиении которых на r множеств выпуклые оболочки множеств не имеют общей точки.

Theorem 8.5 (Tverberg)**.** *Для любых d, r любые $(d + 1)(r - 1) + 1$ точки в $\mathbb{R}^d$ можно разбить на r множеств, выпуклые оболочки которых имеют общую точку.*

Theorem 8.6. *(a) Для любых d и непрерывного отображения $(d+1)$-мерного симплекса в $\mathbb{R}^d$ существуют 2 непересекающиеся грани симплекса, образы которых пересекаются.*

(b) Для любых d и непрерывного отображения $(2d + 2)$-мерного симплекса в $\mathbb{R}^d$ существуют 3 попарно непересекающиеся грани симплекса, образы которых имеют общую точку.

(c) Если r — степень простого, то для любых d непрерывного отображения $(d + 1)(r-1)$-мерного симплекса в $\mathbb{R}^d$ существуют r попарно непересекающиеся граней симплекса, образы которых имеют общую точку.

Эти результаты доказываются при помощи *теоремы Борсука-Улама* и ее обобщений. По поводу истории доказательства см., например, [MW].

Топологической гипотезой Тверберг называется аналог этого утверждения для произвольного r.

Theorem 8.7. *[Fr, MW14, MW, Oz] Если r — не степень простого и $d \geq 3r + 1$, то существует непрерывное (даже кусочно-линейное) отображение $(d+1)(r-1)$-мерного симплекса в $\mathbb{R}^d$, при котором образы любых r попарно непересекающихся граней не имеют общей точки.*

Hints to remarks

4.6. (b) Let triangle Δ be linked with triangle Δ'. By the Symmetry Lemma 2.2 Δ intersects plane containing Δ', so $\Delta \cap l \neq \emptyset$. By general position, the intersection $\Delta \cap l$ is exactly two points. Now let us prove that the pairs of points are proved. Denote by A, B the intersection

points $\Delta \cap l$ and by A', B' the intersection points $\Delta' \cap l$. The intersection of Δ and two-dimensional triangle Δ' is a subset of segment $A'B'$. So exactly one of points A and B is in the segment $A'B'$. So pairs A, B and A', B' are linked in l.

Let us prove the converse. Let the pairs A, B and A', B' be linked in l. Then according to the previous assertion, Δ intersects the two-dimensional triangle Δ' by exactly one point, i.e. Δ is linked with Δ'.

4.7. (b) *An intuitive argument.* Since the vertices move continuously so that they remain in general position, the number of points at which the outline of the first triangle intersects the second triangle, is preserved. Thus the triangles remain linked or unlinked.

Another intuitive argument. Let us use the Symmetry Lemma 2.2. When points move so that they remain in general position and the planes containing triangles are not parallel, the four points in the line l move continuously, so they are either always linked or always unlinked. If there is a moment when the planes containing the triangles are parallel, then at this moment and during some time before and after this moment the triangles are unlinked.

Hint to a rigorous solution. The number of intersections of a segment and a triangle (whose 5 vertices are in general position) is preserved under small enough change of the 5 vertices.

6.1. Choose three points in 3-space that do not belong to one line. Suppose that we have $n \geq 3$ points in general position. Then there is a finite number of planes containing triples of these n points. Hence there is a point that does not lye on any of these planes. Add this point to our set of n points. Since the 'new' point is not in one plane with any three of the 'old' n points, the obtained set of $n+1$ points is in general position. Thus *for each n there exist n points in 3-space that are in general position.*

Take such n points. Denote by A the set of all segments joining pairs of these points. If some two segments from A with different endpoints intersect, then four endpoints of these two segments are in one plane. If some two segments from A with common endpoint intersect not only at their common endpoint, then the three endpoints of these two segments are on one line. These contradictions show that A is embedded.

6.2. (a) 5 точек можно привести в общее положение, не изменяя ни одного из рассматриваемых свойств. By hypothesis, the number of intersection points of segment 12 and the outline of triangle 345 equals to the number of intersection points of interiors of segments joining the points. This is odd by the Intersection Property 2.1.

7.2. (b) See Figure 11. By General Position Theorem 6.1 there exist n points $1, \dots, n$ in a three-dimensional hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^4$ so that the set of all the segments joining the points is embedded. Take a point $0 \in \mathbb{R}^4$ not belonging to the three-dimensional hyperplane. Then the points $0, 1, \dots, n$ are the required ones.

7.3. The proof is analogous to General Position Theorem 6.1. A set of points in $\mathbb{R}^5$ is *in general position*, if no six of these points are in one four-dimensional hyperplane.

References

[ARS01] *P. Akhmetiev, D. Repovš and A. Skopenkov.* Embedding products of low-dimensional manifolds in $\mathbb{R}^m$, Topol. Appl. 2001. 113. P. 7-12.

[BE82] *V.G. Boltyansky and V.A. Efremovich.* Intuitive Combinatorial Topology. Springer. Russian version: Moscow, Nauka, 1982.

[BM] *I. Bogdanov and A. Matushkin.* Algebraic proofs of linear versions of the Conway–Gordon–Sachs theorem and the van Kampen–Flores theorem http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03185

[Br72] *J. L. Bryant.* Approximating embeddings of polyhedra in codimension 3, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 170 (1972) 85–95.

[CG83] *J. H. Conway and C. M. A. Gordon*, Knots and links in spatial graphs, J. Graph Theory 7 (1983), 445–453.

[Fl34] *A. Flores*, Über n-dimensionale Komplexe die im E^{2n+1} absolut selbstverschlungen sind, Ergeb. Math. Koll. 6 (1934) 4–7.

[Fo04] *R. Fokkink.* A forgotten mathematician, European Mathematical Society Newsletter 52 (2004) 9–14. http://www.ems-ph.org/journals/newsletter/pdf/2004-06-52.pdf

[Fr] *F. Frick*, Counterexamples to the topological Tverberg conjecture, http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.00947

[I] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Impossible_objects

[Me29] *K. Menger.*Über plättbare Dreiergraphen und Potenzen nicht plättbarer Graphen, Ergebnisse Math. Kolloq., 2 (1929) 30-31.

[Mo77] *E. E. Moise.* Geometric Topology in Dimensions 2 and 3 (GTM), Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[MSTW14] *J. Matoušek, E. Sedgwick, M. Tancer, U. Wagner*, Embeddability in the 3-sphere is decidable, Proc. 30th Ann. ACM Symp. on Comput. Geom. (SoCG), 2014, 78–84. http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0815

[MTW11] *J. Matoušek, M. Tancer, U. Wagner.* Hardness of embedding simplicial complexes in $\mathbb{R}^d$, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 13(2), 2011, 259–295. http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.0336

[MW14] *I. Mabillard and U. Wagner.* Eliminating Tverberg Points, I. An Analogue of the Whitney Trick. Proc. 30th Ann. ACM Symp. on Comput. Geom. (SoCG), 2014, 171-180.

[MW] *I. Mabillard and U. Wagner.* Eliminating Higher-Multiplicity Intersections, I. A Whitney Trick for Tverberg-Type Problems. http://arxiv.org/pdf/1508.02349v1.pdf

[Oz] *M. Özaydin.* Equivariant maps for the symmetric group. http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/63829

[Pr04] *V.V. Prasolov.* Elements of combinatorical and differential topology, AMS, RI, 2006. Russian version: MCCME, Moscow, 2004, ftp://ftp.mccme.ru/users/prasolov/topology/topol2.pdf

[PS05] *V.V. Prasolov and M. Skopenkov.* Ramsey link theory, Math. Prosveschenie. 9 (2005) 108-115.

[PS11] *Y. Ponty, C. Saule.* A combinatorial framework for designing (pseudoknotted) RNA algorithms, WABI'11 Proceedings of the 11th international conference on Algorithms in bioinformatics, 250-269. http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2039967

[PW] *I. Pak, S. Wilson*, GEOMETRIC REALIZATIONS OF POLYHEDRAL COMPLEXES, http://www.math.ucla.edu/~pak/papers/Fary-full31.pdf

[RS01] *D. Repovs and A. Skopenkov.* On contractible n-dimensional compacta, non-embeddable into $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 129 (2001) 627–628.

[RSS95] *D. Repovs, A. B. Skopenkov and E. V. Scepin.* On embeddability of $X \times I$ into Euclidean space, Houston J. Math. 21 (1995) 199–204.

[RSSZ] *A. Rukhovich, A. Skopenkov, M. Skopenkov, A. Zimin.* Realizability of hypergraphs. http://www.turgor.ru/lktg/2013/1/index.htm

[Sa81] *H. Sachs.* On spatial representation of finite graphs, in: Finite and infinite sets, Colloq. Math. Soc. Janos Bolyai, North Holland, Amsterdam (37) 1981.

[Sk03] *M. Skopenkov.* Embedding products of graphs into Euclidean spaces, Fund. Math. 179 (2003) 191-198. http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.1199

[Sk08] *A. Skopenkov.* Embedding and knotting of manifolds in Euclidean spaces, London Math. Soc. Lect. Notes, 347 (2008) 248–342. http://arxiv.org/abs/0604045

[Sk] *A. Skopenkov,* Algorithms for recognition of the realizability of hypergraphs, predraft of a book, in Russian, www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/algor.pdf

[SZ] *A. Skopenkov and A. Zimin*, Realizability of hypergraphs in Euclidean spaces. http://www.mccme.ru/circles/oim/exalong.pdf

[Um78] *B. Ummel.* The product of nonplanar complexes does not imbed in 4-space, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 242 (1978) 319–328.

[vK32] *E. R. van Kampen*, Komplexe in euklidische Räumen, Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg, 9 (1932) 72–78; Berichtigung dazu, 152–153.

[vK41] *E. R. van Kampen,* Remark on the address of S. S. Cairns, in Lectures in Topology, 311–313, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, 1941.

[Zi] *A. Zimin.* Alternative proofs of the Conway-Gordon-Sachs Theorems. http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.2882

[Zu] *J. Zung.* A non-general-position Parity Lemma. http://www.turgor.ru/lktg/2013/1/parity.pdf